

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 10-14 were examined by the Office, and all claims were rejected in the Office Action of January 5, 2009. With this response, claims 1 and 10 are amended. All amendments are fully supported by the specification as originally filed. Support for the amendment to claim 1 can be found at least from page 1, lines 16-25, and claim 10 is amended to remove an acronym. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in view of the following discussion.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC 103

Claims 1-6 and 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Miyashita (U.S. Patent No. 6,909,906) in view of Steele (U.S. Patent No. 6,201,534). Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, alone or in combination, because the cited references fail to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in claim 1. The cited references at least fail to disclose or suggest that the pointing device is configured to operate independent of a functionality of the existing electronic device, as recited in claim 1. Therefore, for at least this reason, claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

The apparatus of the invention, as recited in claim 1, has in addition to its main function as an existing electronic device, an auxiliary function as an external pointing device that can communicate with any external display device. Claim 1 is amended to clarify that the functionality of the pointing device is independent of the main functionality of the existing electronic device. Therefore, the apparatus when operating as a pointing device is configured to act together with the external display device that is not functionality dependent on the functions of the existing electronic device.

Steele describes that the remote control system (400a) has cursor pointing device components (108a) arranged to control cursor movement on a video monitor. See Steele column 6, lines 40-48. While Steele states that the remote control system includes a wireless terminal or remote controller (414a), this is distinct from the wireless terminal

disclosed in column 2, lines 66-67 and Figure 1. Instead, Steele refers to the remote controller (414a) as discussed in column 6, line 44 to column 7, line 18, which is not a cellular telephone.

In the embodiments of Steele shown in Figures 6a and 6b the device referred to by the Office as “an existing electronic device” has inherent cooperative action with the external display device. In particular, the remote controller communicates with the video monitor, and the computer keyboard communicates with the video monitor. The communication between the device and monitors takes place via a control signal generator. See Steele column 6, lines 53-56; column 7, lines 30-34. Therefore, the functionality of the remote controller or computer keyboard is interrelated with the functionality of the video monitor. The main function of the existing electronic device is to cooperate with the video monitor, for example as shown in Figures 6a and 6b, the integrated cursor pointing device communicates with the monitor via the same control signal generator (406a, 406b), and is therefore tied to cooperate with the same video monitor than the already existing device. Therefore, the pointing device (i.e. auxiliary function) of the remote controller or computer keyboard (i.e. already existing device) depends on the main function of the remote controller or computer keyboard. This is in contrast to claim 1, where the functionality of the pointing device is independent of the functionality of the already existing device, and it is clear from amended claim 1 that the main function of the mobile phone is not to cooperate with the external display device. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

The claims rejected above, and depending from claim 1 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references at least in view of their dependencies.

Conclusion

For all the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all of the claims of the application are now in condition for allowance and their passage to issue is earnestly solicited. The undersigned hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge Deposit Account No. 23-0442 for any fee deficiency required to submit this response.

Respectfully submitted,



Keith R. Obert
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 58,051

Date: 23 March 2009

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, Connecticut 06468
Tel: (203) 261-1234